

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

ROCKY JOE MERTENS, #191 522,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-CV-99-WHA
)	[WO]
STATE OF ALABAMA, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

In this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action, Plaintiff challenges the provision of medical care he received at the Franklin County Jail. The Franklin County Jail is in Russellville, Alabama, which is within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. Accordingly, upon review of the factual allegations presented in the complaint, the court concludes that this case should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404.

I. DISCUSSION

A civil action filed by an inmate under authority of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 “may be brought . . . in (1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred . . . or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). The law further provides that “[f]or the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice,

a district court may transfer any civil action to any other district . . . where it might have been brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).

The actions about which Plaintiff complains occurred within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. The factual allegations set forth in the complaint reflect that the named defendants are located in the Northern District of Alabama. Thus, the majority of material witnesses and evidence associated with Plaintiff’s allegations are located in the Northern District of Alabama.

For these reasons, the court concludes that in the interest of justice and for the convenience of the parties this case should be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama for review and determination.¹

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be TRANSFERRED to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).

It is further ORDERED that **on or before April 18, 2018**, Plaintiff may file an objection to the Recommendation. Any objection filed must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation to which Plaintiff objects. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file a written objection to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge’s report shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of factual findings and legal issues covered in the report and shall “waive the right to challenge on

¹ In so ruling, the court does not preliminarily assess the merits of Plaintiff’s complaint against the named parties.

appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions" except upon grounds of plain error if necessary in the interests of justice. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

DONE on this 4th day of April, 2018.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'GB' with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

GRAY M. BORDEN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE